



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/725,122

11/29/2000

Tapio Mansikkaniemi

004770.00579

9055

22907 7590 10/14/2008

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

1100 13th STREET, N.W.

SUITE 1200

WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051

EXAMINER

SAX, STEVEN PAUL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/14/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/725,122	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MANSIKKANIEMI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Steven P. Sax	<b>Art Unit</b> 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 48-98 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 48-98 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been examined. The amendment filed 7/17/08 has been entered.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 48-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al (6278456) and Pancha et al (6823373).

4. Regarding claim 48, Wang et al show an apparatus comprising:  
a processor configured to communicate with a plurality of devices operable to belong to a group (Figures 1, 3, column 3 lines 50-63), the processor configured to perform: receiving calendar information from one or more of the plurality of devices, the calendar information comprising one or more calendar events from a first device of the group and one or more private calendar events from the first device of the group (column 4 lines 1-25, column 6 lines 12-40); maintaining a group calendar comprising the one or more calendar events and providing access to the group calendar by the plurality of devices of the group (Figure 2, column 9 lines 8-35, column 11 lines

Art Unit: 2174

18-24); maintaining an individual calendar corresponding to the first device of the group, the individual calendar comprising the one or more calendar events and the one or more private calendar events and providing access to the individual calendar only by the first device of the group (column 11 lines 10-50). Wang et al do not go into the details that the devices are wireless per se, but do discuss efficient use of devices flexibly located in a network. Furthermore, Pancha et al do show wireless devices in a group receiving calendar information, for efficient use of devices flexibly located in a network (Figure 18C, column 3 lines 38-62, column 4 lines 49-62, column 11 lines 25-50). It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this in Wang et al, for efficient use of devices flexibly located in a network receiving calendar information.

5. Regarding claim 49, the processor is further configured to perform providing equal access to each of the plurality of wireless devices to modify the group calendar (Wang et al column 6 lines 16-30).

6. Regarding claim 50, the processor is configured for communication with the plurality of wireless devices through communication with an access point in communication with the plurality of wireless devices (Pancha et al column 3 lines 45-63. The obviousness to have this in Wang et al is explained in paragraph 4 of this Office Action).

7. Regarding claim 51, the processor is further configured to perform authenticating the first device prior to providing access to the individual calendar (Wang et al column 6 lines 40-63).

8. Regarding claim 52, the processor is further configured to perform receiving calendar information from the plurality of devices, the calendar information comprising one or more calendar events from each device of the group; maintaining the group calendar so as to include the calendar events from all devices of the group and exclude the one or more private calendar events from the first wireless device; and maintaining the individual calendar comprising the one or more calendar events from all devices of the group and the one or more private calendar events from the first device (Wang et al column 9 lines 8-35, column 11 lines 18-24).

9. Regarding claim 53, the calendar information includes one or more private calendar events from each wireless device, and the processor is further configured to perform maintaining a plurality of individual calendars, each individual calendar corresponding to one device of the group, wherein each individual calendar comprises the one or more calendar events from all device of the group and the one or more private calendar events from the corresponding device; and providing access to each individual calendar only by the corresponding device (Wang et al column 6 lines 30-55, column 9 lines 8-35, column 11 lines 18-24).

10. Regarding claim 54, the processor is further configured to perform providing equal access to each of the plurality of devices to modify the group calendar (Wang et al column 9 lines 8-30).

11. Regarding claim 55, the processor is further configured to perform authenticating each device prior to providing access to each individual calendar (Wang et al column 7 lines 5-40).

12. Regarding claim 56, the apparatus contains information of a valid identifier of each device enabling service and a configuration tool configured for managing at least some configurable controlling functions of a browser from the device (Wang et al column 9 lines 10-33).

13. Regarding claim 57, the processor is further configured to perform receiving, from one of the devices, a command to modify content of the group calendar; modifying the group calendar according to the command; and providing access to the modified group calendar by the plurality of devices (Wang et al column 6 lines 16-30).

14. Regarding claim 58, the processor is further configured to perform providing access only to the first wireless device to modify the individual calendar (Wang et al column 11 lines 10-40).

15. Claims 59-68 show the same features as claims 48-58 and are rejected for the same reasons.

16. Claims 69-72 show the same features as claims 48-51 and are rejected for the same reasons.

17. Regarding claim 73, the processor is further configured to perform transmitting, to the server, a command to modify content of the group calendar; and accessing the group calendar, wherein the group calendar has been modified by the server according to the command (Wang et al column 6 lines 16-40).

18. Regarding claim 74, the processor is further configured to perform accessing a group notice board maintained on the server, the group notice board comprising at least some of the calendar information (column 11 lines 1-47).

19. Regarding claim 75, the processor is further configured to perform creating each calendar event and each private calendar event by entry into a new calendar event view (column 11 lines 1-47).

20. Claims 76-82 show the same features as claims 69-75 and are rejected for the same reasons.

21. Claims 83-88 show the same features as claims 48, 51, 54, 52, 53, and 55, and are rejected for the same reasons.

22. Claims 89-98 show the same features as claims 59-68, as admitted by applicant, and are rejected for the same reasons.

23. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

24. Claims 89-98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. These claims are directed to a machine readable medium which per the specification may be a signal. Such a medium is not statutory subject matter.

25. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Wang in fact does have individual calendar events in the sense that these are personal to the user and unique to that wireless device. This is in addition to the shared common calendar events that are at each device. Applicant's claims are broad in that they do not go into the details of how the individual and common events are combined or displayed within a single calendar. Wang has both types of events and this constitutes being on the same calendar. If applicant means more, this must be



Art Unit: 2174

brought out in the claims. Each wireless device has equal access to the shared events and may add a modification. Whether it takes an additional step of calling to the server and then having the server transmit to each of the devices is not relevant in the sense that applicant's claims do not distinguish over the process taught by the combination of Wang and Pancha. Each calendar is maintained to have equal access and, at a given moment, to have the common shared events and that device's individual events combined, with equal access to the shared events. Applicant's representative is invited to contact Examiner to continue discussion of the claims.

26. Applicant's amendment having the new claims necessitated the new 101 rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

27. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven P. Sax whose telephone number is (571) 272-4072. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Steven P Sax/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174

\*\*\*